



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,727	11/26/2003	Fernando C. M. Martins	042390.P16775	9793

45209 7590 01/16/2009

INTEL/BSTZ  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
----------

WALERIC CHARLES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/16/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/723,727

**Applicant(s)**

MARTINS ET AL.

**Examiner**

ERIC C. WAI

**Art Unit**

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-13, 17-25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 7-13, 17-25, and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-2, 7-13, 17-25, and 27 are presented for examination.

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/03/2008 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 7-13, 17-25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naik et al. (US PG Pub No. US 2006/0294238 A1) in view of Bulson et al. (US PG Pub No. US 2005/0060704 A1).
5. Regarding claim 1, Naik teaches a method of sharing resources on a grid network, comprising:

configuring a host to include a grid virtual machine ([0074] lines 10-15, wherein a host computer includes a virtual machine and operating system that can support grid applications), where the grid virtual machine is isolated from the second virtual machine ([0021]);

allocating base resources on the host to the grid virtual machine (it is inherent that resources be allocated to the grid VM running on the host);

allocating supplemental resources to the grid virtual machine according to predefined policies ([0024], [0048] and [0055], wherein a hierarchy of resource managers assists in managing resources);

enabling the grid virtual machine to execute a grid application in conjunction with other resources on the grid network ([0074] line 14, wherein it is inherent that the application is executed); and

dynamically balancing the load on the host while the grid application is executing ([0048-055], wherein the resource manager can predict and forecast the load on the resources).

6. Naik does not explicitly teach a second virtual machine and that the second virtual machine is configured to run applications other than the grid application.
7. Bulson teaches the use of virtual machines in a grid environment ([0018]). Bulson teaches the use of multiple virtual machines in each node of the grid environment where each virtual machine is capable of functioning as a separate system. As such, each virtual machine can be independently host an operating system and operate with different programs ([0023]).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a second virtual machine running applications other than the grid application could exist on the system. One would be motivated by the desire to isolate the operation of another virtual machine to perform other services as indicated by Bulson ([0023]) and Naik ([0021]).

9. Regarding claim 2, Naik teaches that allocating the resources further comprises a virtual machine manager allocating at least the portion of the resources ([0074] lines 15-16, wherein it is well known in the art that a VMM assists in mapping resources).

10. Regarding claim 7, Naik teaches:  
retrieving predefined policies for the grid virtual machine ([0077]); and  
monitoring the grid virtual machine to determine if the grid virtual machine violates the predefined policies ([0077], wherein the policy handler enforces the policies).

11. Regarding claim 8, Naik teaches that the predefined policies include predefined resource thresholds for the grid virtual machine ([0078]).

12. Regarding claim 9, Naik teaches that a resource manager takes appropriate action if the grid virtual machine violates at least one of the predefined policies ([0078]).

13. Regarding claim 10, Naik teaches that the resource manager taking action further comprises at least one of the resource manager automatically limiting resources available to the grid virtual machine ([0078]), and the resource manager notifying a user that the grid virtual machine violated at least one of the predefined policies.

14. Regarding claims 11-13, and 17-20, they are the article claims of claims 1-2, and 7-10 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-4, and 7-10 above.

15. Regarding claims 21-24, they are the system claims of claims 1-2, 7, and 9-10 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-2, 7, and 9-10 above.

16. Regarding claim 25, Naik teaches a grid network, comprising:  
a first host capable of running a first grid virtual machine and a second virtual machine ([0074]), the second virtual machine isolated from the first grid virtual machine ([0021], wherein each virtual machine is isolated from each other), the first host additionally running a first resource manager to allocate supplemental resources to the first grid virtual machine ([0024], [0048] and [0055], wherein a hierarchy of resource managers assists in managing resources).

17. Naik does not explicitly teach a second host coupled to the first host, the second host capable of running a second grid virtual machine and a third virtual machine, the

first grid virtual machine and the second grid virtual machine capable of simultaneously executing a grid application, the second host additionally running a second resource manager to allocate supplemental resources to the third grid virtual machine.

18. However, Naik teaches the concept of grid computing wherein it is inherent that multiple host computers exist in a loosely coupled fashion to perform a common task ([0007]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a second host coupled to the first host with similar capabilities to execute a common application. One would be motivated by the desire to pool together many computing resources to perform a large task ([0006]).

19. Naik does not explicitly teach that the second virtual machine is configured to run applications other than the grid application and that the first host additionally running a first virtual machine manager to allocate base resources to the first grid virtual machine and the second virtual machine,

20. Bulson teaches the use of virtual machines in a grid environment ([0018]). Bulson teaches the use of multiple virtual machines in each node of the grid environment where each virtual machine is capable of functioning as a separate system. As such, each virtual machine can be independently host an operating system and operate with different programs ([0023]). Bulson further teaches the use of a manager virtual machine ([0024]).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a second virtual machine running applications other than the grid application could exist on the system.

One would be motivated by the desire to isolate the operation of another virtual machine to perform other services as indicated by Bulson ([0023]) and Naik ([0021]).

22. Regarding claim 27, Naik teaches that the first resource manager and the second resource manager are additionally capable of retrieving policies for the first grid virtual machine and the second grid virtual machine respectively ([0077]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7-13, 17-25, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric C. Wai whose telephone number is 571-270-1012. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng - Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Eric C Wai/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2195